United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.49

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 49th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 22 November 2011, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-60366 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Cesa** (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, made the following oral amendments to the draft resolution. In the second to last line of the fourteenth preambular paragraph, the phrase "in particular, agricultural subsidies" should be deleted, and in paragraph 5, the word "crises" should be replaced by the word "prices".

3. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

4. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the United States of America strongly supported the goals set forth in the draft resolution, and was committed to accelerating progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals, including Goal 1 on halving global hunger and poverty rates, by investing in country plans to boost agricultural development. Furthermore, his Government welcomed the attention given in the draft resolution to the rights of indigenous peoples, and echoed the call to promote respect of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the context of development.

5. Nevertheless, his delegation reiterated its concern that a better balance had not been struck in the analysis of the relative impact of external and internal factors on social development. The draft resolution also mischaracterized the current state of financial markets and food security issues. The international community had long acknowledged that the primary responsibility for social and economic development rested with national Governments. While external economic factors could certainly affect a country's development, it mattered more whether national domestic policies responded to the aspirations of ordinary citizens, provided them opportunities, removed obstacles to broad-based economic growth and addressed their needs. In the case of food security, solutions must not only focus on external threats such as natural disasters and trade distortion but also on domestic food security issues such as lack of a domestic environment that enabled investment in agriculture. The draft resolution continued to overlook the need to retool domestic policies to foster agricultural growth. Moreover, the references in the text to food security and current financial and economic issues were at odds with the views of United Nations experts and many other members of the world community, who agreed that the world was not going currently going through a food crisis.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

6. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

7. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the main sponsors had requested that the following corrections should be made to the draft resolution to reflect the text as submitted to the Secretariat. In the second line of the third preambular paragraph, the words "Human Rights" should be added before the words "Council resolution S-17/1 of 23 August 2011". In the same paragraph, the phrase "in which the Council decided to dispatch urgently" should be replaced with the phrase "which established an independent international commission of inquiry". In the second line of the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "of Arab States" should be added; the text would read "the steps undertaken by the League of Arab States." He announced that Kuwait had joined the sponsors.

8. **Mr. Lyall Grant** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that the sponsors had proposed the draft resolution in response to the ongoing and widespread violence and human rights violations that had persisted in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011. Despite repeated calls from the international community, the violence continued, with the latest United Nations report estimating that well over 3,500 civilians had been killed to date. The Syrian authorities had refused to allow a United Nations-mandated commission of

inquiry access and had failed to implement the plan of action agreed on with the League of Arab States. Under those circumstances, the international community could not remain silent. The cross-regional draft resolution, an initiative intended to respond to critical events, called for the full implementation of the plan of action in its entirety and without delay. It did not aim at creating any new mechanisms or procedures, but to send a strong signal that ongoing violations and violence must come to an end.

9. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, reiterated its firm position, expressed at various high-level meetings, against the continued selectivity, politicization and double standards reflected in country-specific resolutions, which targeted developing countries that were also members of the Movement. The alarming increase in the adoption of such resolutions by the General Assembly constituted a clear exploitation by certain States of the question of human rights merely for political ends and had a negative impact on the credibility of United Nations efforts to promote and protect human rights, which should be governed by the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity. The Human Rights Council, and in particular, the universal periodic review, constituted the appropriate mechanisms for considering human rights situations in all countries, based on constructive dialogue. The Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement would therefore vote against the draft resolution and called on all other delegations to do so as well.

10. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on a point of order, moved for the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution, based on the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Country-specific situations must be considered in the context of the Human Rights Council's universal periodic review — which his country had recently undergone — not in the Committee. His Government's acceptance of a high percentage of recommendations reflected its commitment to promoting and protecting human rights at the national level.

11. Recalling his country's thousands of years of history, its role in the birth and development of the three monotheistic faiths and its steadfast opposition to foreign interference in the affairs of sovereign States, he noted that the Syrian Arab Republic had voted in favour of granting independence to tens of former colonies under Western rule — countries that were represented in the United Nations as equals alongside their former colonizers. His country had never withheld assistance to those seeking it, while others had shied away from doing so out of cowardice, only heeding limited political calculations.

12. Like any Member State, his country had some problems, and reform was indeed called for in several areas of political, economic and social life. Nevertheless, such reforms would not come in the form of suspiciously political draft resolutions sponsored by certain Member States in order to blackmail others, using the United Nations as a platform, nor by conducting a media, political and diplomatic war against the Syrian Arab Republic, or interfering in its internal affairs. The best way to help the reform process was for those States sponsoring the draft resolution to halt their media campaigns against his country, and to encourage armed opposition groups to renounce violence and participate in the mechanisms established to facilitate an inclusive national dialogue.

13. Unfortunately, every year a small number of countries hijacked the work of the Committee to force through their political objectives, which hindered the Committee from achieving the goals set out in its work on human rights. Some States sponsoring the draft resolution were part of the reason violence continued and was escalating in his country, as they were fomenting sectarian strife and pushing the country to the brink of civil war. He therefore wondered how those States could call for the protection of human rights of Syrian civilians, even as they were imposing economic and financial sanctions against the Syrian people, threatening to interrupt electricity and water supply, and hosting in their capitals meetings of armed Syrian opposition groups. Those groups had been allowed to issue declarations publicly from their land and claim responsibility for armed terrorist operations against Government objectives and interests inside the country.

14. The previous week, 90 people had been killed in Syria in a single day; his Government was only now making public the fact that 79 of them came from the ranks of the armed forces. His Government was deeply saddened by all the deaths and held those persons stoking the flames of strife fully responsible. Yet his delegation had not seen the same enthusiasm on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution for pressuring Israel, the occupying Power, to end its

occupation of Arab territories, establishment of settlements, and to establish a Palestinian State. The double standard attested to political hypocrisy, moral deficit and short-sightedness. Thousands of resolutions and tens of fact-finding missions had come out of the United Nations, all to no avail. The only part of any resolution on the Arab-Israeli conflict that had been implemented by Israel and its protectors was half of the resolution on the partition of Palestine, while the other half, regarding the establishment of a Palestinian State in Palestine itself, had been forgotten.

15. His delegation called on Member States to realize the danger of accusing States of committing human rights violations, thus politicizing of the work of the Committee and deviating from pursuit of the noble goals and principles of human rights. He urged Member States to search their consciences and show their respect for human rights by upholding the truth, namely, that his country merely strove to preserve its sovereignty and bring about improvements in society by undertaking Government-planned reforms that had the endorsement and trust of the Syrian people. He took pride in the fact that the Syrian Arab Republic had achieved full independence and would not allow colonial powers, past or present, to interfere in its internal affairs again. For all those reasons, he urged all delegations to vote in favour of the motion.

16. **The Chair** said that, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he would give the floor to two delegations in favour of the motion to adjourn debate and two delegations that opposed it, following which the motion would be immediately put to the vote.

17. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua), speaking in favour of the motion to adjourn consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1, expressed concern over the increase in country-specific resolutions, which, rather than promoting human rights, reflected selectivity, politicization and double standards. Countries that were genuinely concerned with the human rights situations of others should first evaluate their own situations and, if after doing so, they still felt morally entitled to criticize others, they should proceed in a spirit of respect and collaboration. While the Human Rights Council remained the ideal tool for the consideration of human rights issues, country-specific resolutions adopted in the General Assembly had proven ineffective and exacerbated adversarial relations between Member States. Moreover, such resolutions only targeted developing countries and never their developed counterparts, despite the massive human rights violations they committed. For that reason, Nicaragua supported the no-action motion and called on all countries, developing and developed alike, to vote in favour of it, in the interest of non-interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States and collaboration on promoting and protecting human rights marked by mutual respect. Developed countries had the opportunity to contribute to the promotion of human rights by meeting their official development assistance commitments, as extreme poverty inhibited the effective exercise of all human rights.

18. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country had a traditional principled position against country-specific resolutions, which accused countries selectively and on the basis of political motivations that had nothing to do with the defence of human rights. The establishment of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review mechanism had made it possible to consider human rights situations in all countries in a just, balanced and constructive manner. Therefore, her delegation believed that consideration of the draft resolution in the General Assembly was unjustified and must be removed from the Committee's agenda immediately, being as it violated the principles of respectful dialogue, international cooperation and impartiality that must govern approaches to human rights issues. The type of action being proposed constituted a tool used by imperialist powers to defend purely political interests. It was ironic that the imperialists of the day proclaimed themselves sacrosanct defenders of human rights, for the reality exposed their double standards. She therefore called on all States to vote in favour of the no-action motion, regardless of their position on the draft resolution.

19. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) said that the situation in the sister nation of the Syrian Arab Republic had reached a critical juncture and could not be ignored. His Government had called on the Syrian authorities to put an end to the violence and begin a comprehensive dialogue and genuine reform. Saudi Arabia had worked with other Arab countries to put in place a comprehensive plan of action to resolve the Syrian crisis, preserve Syria's security and safety, protect its sovereignty and spare it the dangers of foreign intervention. The Syrian Government had

initially agreed to the plan but had then reverted to obstructing its implementation.

20. His delegation fully grasped the great role that Syria had played throughout its long and distinguished history and appreciated the sacrifices made by the Syrian people and its support for peoples struggling to liberate themselves. For that reason, voting to adjourn the debate on the draft resolution would send the message to the Syrian people that the international community valued neither their suffering nor the blood spilled by their children, a message unworthy of the United Nations and its Member States. The draft resolution was not country-specific but rather dealt with a unique situation that his delegation hoped would not recur. Saudi Arabia therefore called on Member States to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate so that the international community's honest opinion on the draft resolution might be voiced, particularly since it affirmed the Arab Initiative of the League of Arab States. The Initiative focused on the need to end the cycle of violence in Syria, whatever its source, to protect human rights and to preserve Syrian unity and sovereignty, avoiding foreign intervention in its internal affairs.

21. **Mr. Araud** (France) said that the draft resolution was not a country-specific resolution but rather a unique initiative justified by the urgency of the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, which continued to deteriorate, with that country rejecting the peace plan proposed by the League of Arab States and the number of victims steadily rising. A vote to adjourn the debate on the draft resolution would be tantamount to denying the urgency and the need for the draft resolution, which had the support of various countries in the region. The short text called for an end to violence and support for the initiative of the League of Arab States. His country would therefore vote against the motion so as to reject the attempt to end the debate on such a crucial question.

22. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion for the adjournment of debate concerning draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guyana, India, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

23. *The motion was rejected by 118 votes to 20, with 29 abstentions.*

24. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that one of his colleagues — whose delegation he would

not refer to by name out of respect for their shared Arab traditions — had called on all armed parties in the Syrian Arab Republic to stop the violence. While his Government would endorse that stance, the draft resolution being considered was devoid of any comparable political balance and took a hostile position on the issue of stability in the country. Moreover, the country from which his colleague hailed was hosting a Salafi satellite television network that was working without interruption to foment sectarian strife among Syrians.

25. First and foremost, his delegation questioned the allusion to the Charter of the United Nations in the draft resolution, given that the sponsors had effectively violated the sanctity of the Charter by disregarding the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. It was also surprising that the sponsors were inviting the Syrian authorities to implement the plan of action of the League of Arab States on the situation in his country, when his country had already signed the document and welcomed the committee in charge of following up the initiative. His Government had also accepted the draft protocol adopted by the ministerial meeting of the League, which called for sending a mission to verify the implementation of the plan of action and to evaluate the situation in his country firsthand, away from the media disinformation campaigns. However, the draft resolution neglected to mention the armed groups that jeopardized the security of citizens and property, something any sovereign State would categorically refuse to accept. It was ironic that some of the sponsors accused those resisting foreign occupation in Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, the occupied Syrian Golan and elsewhere of terrorism, and insisted that no terrorist groups were active in Syria, even as the heads of those groups had made public declarations and confessions of their deeds. Those States refused to recognize the existence of armed groups because it was they who were responsible for arming, financing and protecting them.

26. It was no secret that the United States of America was the chief instigator and mastermind of the political campaign against his country. Ultimately, the draft resolution had nothing to do with human rights and was simply part of its hostile policy towards the Syrian Arab Republic.

27. His delegation had transmitted to the Secretary-General, the President of the Security Council and the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee a detailed letter identifying the persons responsible for smuggling weapons into the Syrian Arab Republic from neighbouring countries, their crimes, the types of weapons smuggled and the number of persons killed. In addition to that document (S/2011/707), his delegation was reporting to the Secretary-General and to the Security Council on the steps taken towards reform, including the release of thousands of detainees not guilty of shedding blood and the establishment of national commissions of enquiry into some of the abuses that occurred against civilians. Nevertheless, the draft resolution regrettably omitted all information provided by his Government and instead took a selective and blatantly deceptive approach. The sponsors of the draft resolution had a poor record in the area of human rights; European countries and the United States of America continued to invade and impose unilateral economic sanctions on developing countries, thus depriving them of their rights to live in peace and security and to development. Against that backdrop, he wondered how the sponsors could defend human rights given their own fundamental failure to protect the human rights of women, foreigners, religious minorities and other groups.

28. The United States of America, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Germany, Canada and the European countries sponsoring the draft resolution had punished and were still punishing the Palestinian people for exercising their choice in a democratic electoral process, and were complicit in crimes against humanity through their silence on and support of Israeli occupation of Arab territories and massacres of Arab peoples. However, some sponsors were not aware that they were helping the plans of others by drawing attention away from the Israeli occupation and preventing the establishment of a Palestinian State. The threat of the United States and some European countries to cut off aid to Palestinians if they submitted their legitimate request for full membership in the United Nations attested to the ill will of the sponsors towards his country and their desire to pressure it into changing its strategic political choices, and exposed the aim of the resolution as a patently political one. His delegation therefore called on Member States with a conscience to support both the Syrian State and people, acknowledge its right to make its own democratic choices, and reject any foreign interference in its internal affairs. He invited those countries to put a stop to the plot, the existence of which was becoming more apparent with every

irresponsible statement made by the foreign ministers of several of the States sponsoring the draft resolution.

29. The promotion by some sponsors of the demands of the radical Syrian opposition, namely, overthrow of the regime by force, was a coup attempt supported from abroad, not a reform process; the United Nations must never support such a project. In that connection, he wondered whether the statements by some leaders and foreign ministers of States Members of the United Nations calling for the ouster of the Syrian president might be considered a flagrant violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, not to mention a gross interference in Syrian internal affairs and incitement of the Syrian street against the legitimate leadership and national dialogue. The "Arab Spring" was merely a reformulation of the Sykes-Picot colonial convention to build the so-called "New Middle East", an entity led by Israel and intended to replace what was known as the Arab nation, based on the fragmentation of the region's countries along sectarian, ethnic and religious lines. That transformation would pave the way for a new ethnic cleansing against the Palestinians in their homeland and prevent the establishment of an independent Palestinian State.

30. The draft resolution and the ridiculous plots and manoeuvres against his country would not deter it from moving forward on reform and protecting the Syrian people from foreign interference and ambitions. The Syrian Arab Republic was determined to uphold and promote the human rights and fundamental freedoms of its people and to continue its role in enhancing international cooperation on human rights issues. In light of the above, he requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and hoped that all Member States would oppose it.

31. **Mr. Al Habib** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and Organization of Islamic Cooperation, his Government opposed country-specific resolutions in the Committee. Country-specific situations should be addressed through the appropriate United Nations mechanisms, including the universal periodic review — a process in which the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic had cooperated.

32. The Committee's undertaking of country-specific resolutions led it down the same path of politicization as the now-defunct Human Rights Commission, hindering the promotion and protection of human rights. It was only through cooperation and dialogue, in a way that ensured equality and the sovereign rights of States, rather than through pressure and mischievous intentions, that those rights could be ensured. His delegation would thus vote against the draft resolution.

33. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her Government rejected the selective singling out of countries under the pretext of defending human rights. Country-specific resolutions were being used to fulfil political agendas and satisfy neo-colonial desires for the market domination of other countries' resources. Some powers were using the noble principles of human rights for the sole purpose of geopolitical domination. Transparency and cooperation were key to ensuring the promotion and protection of human rights. In that respect, her Government applauded the efforts made by the Syrian Arab Republic to engage in dialogue with the opposition. Outside interference was regrettable; the matter under consideration fell under the purview of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review, not the Committee. Cooperation, impartiality, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty must underpin any action undertaken for the promotion and protection of human rights. Diplomacy should be used for peace, not war. Venezuela would thus be voting against the draft resolution, and urged all delegations to do the same.

34. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her country rejected country-specific resolutions because they were politically-motivated and unrelated to human rights. It was that very harmful and selective practice of double standards on human rights issues which had led to the dissolution of the Human Rights Commission. The universal periodic review was the mechanism for examining countries' human rights situations on equal footing and through constructive dialogue. International cooperation based on the principles of objectivity, non-conditionality and non-selectivity was the only way to protect human rights. Unfortunately, that was not the purpose of the draft resolution, which reflected clear political motivations. Cuba would thus be voting against it.

35. **Mr. Kim** Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government rejected the draft resolution and was deeply concerned about the continuing practice of selectivity and country-specific

resolutions. It was with objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity that human rights should be considered, and in the framework of the universal periodic review, on equal footing. Such country-specific resolutions were politically motivated and used human rights as a pretext when the true aim was to pressure the developing countries they targeted, including his own country. That approach was regrettable and must be stopped. His delegation strongly opposed the draft resolution and would be voting against it.

36. *At the request of the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/57/Rev.1 was adopted by 122 votes to 13, with 41 abstentions.*

38. **Mr. Tsymbaliuk** (Ukraine) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that in paragraph two, the call for an immediate end to all violence in the Syrian Arab Republic referred to all parties involved in the confrontation.

39. **Mr. Wang** Min (China) said that his delegation had always maintained that human rights matters were best addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation rather than through pressure and country-specific resolutions. His Government called on the Syrian Arab Republic to put an end to the violence and establish order through a balanced process. It endorsed the Plan of action of the League of Arab States. For those reasons, China had voted in favour of the no-action motion and had abstained on the draft resolution.

40. **Mr. Bui** The Giang (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because his Government did not support country-specific resolutions. At the same time, it was concerned about the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and called on all parties there to put an end to the violence and conflict, and engage in constructive and peaceful dialogue.

41. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote. It took note that the Syrian Arab Republic had taken steps to engage with the international community, including through its participation in the universal periodic review process.

Malaysia firmly believed in adopting a non-confrontational approach on all matters, including human rights, and in respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. Human rights should not be politicized, including through the selective targeting of countries. The Government of the Syrian Arabic Republic had a positive role to play in the process, and the best approach the international community could take was to engage in cooperative and constructive dialogue.

42. **Mr. Prosor** (Israel) said that his Government supported the draft resolution. The Syrian delegation's attacks on his country were an attempt to divert attention away from the matter at hand, which was of serious concern. Israel stood ready to engage with other countries in the Middle East to promote peace, stability and freedom.

43. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as an expression of Egypt's support, based on its own revolution of 25 January 2011, for the demands by the Syrian people for fundamental reforms that would enable them to live in freedom, dignity and democracy, to achieve better living standards and to ensure the full respect of the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Moreover, the text of the draft resolution had been made more consistent with the position adopted by the Council of the League of Arab States at the Foreign Minister level at its two meetings on 12 and 16 November 2011. The draft was thus based on the full and immediate implementation of the Plan of Action of the League of Arab States, calling, inter alia, for the immediate cessation of military actions and the dispatch of an observer mission to the Syrian Arab Republic. It was also based on ensuring the honest implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-16/1 of 29 April and S-17/1 of 22 August, including for guaranteeing cooperation of the Syrian authorities with the independent fact-finding mission.

44. Lastly, the draft resolution helped preserve the unity and territorial integrity of the Syrian Arab Republic and could not be interpreted as an invitation for foreign intervention. That was made clear in the recently added eighth preambular paragraph which stated that all States Members of the United Nations should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or act in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations — a clear assertion of the importance of reaching a comprehensive political settlement on the deteriorating situation in the country.

45. **Mr. Karev** (Russian Federation) said that his country had consistently opposed unilateral country-specific resolutions as they did not help to resolve human rights situations. States themselves had the primary responsibility of ensuring the protection and promotion of human rights while it fell to the international community to provide them with technical assistance. It was such assistance, and not mentoring, that the Syrian Arab Republic needed more than ever. The violence in that country must be ended and national dialogue on democratic processes stepped up. Nevertheless, the Syrian authorities' efforts to improve the situation in the country should not be overlooked, and they should be given the opportunity to resolve the situation for themselves. It was thus inadmissible to use force or intervention in the Syrian Arab Republic. The human rights situation in any country could be a source of concern for the international community. However, those issues should not be used as a pretext for interference in State affairs. His delegation had thus abstained from the vote.

46. **Mr. Srivali** (Singapore) said that his Government maintained a position of principle against country-specific resolutions. Nevertheless, its abstention from the vote should not be interpreted as its taking a position on the human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, or as condoning the mistreatment of citizens. He called on all States to promote and protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all citizens.

47. **Ms. Andamo** (Thailand) said that her Government had serious concerns about the violence that was occurring in the Syrian Arab Republic and hoped that stability and a long-term solution could be found, and that the recommendations from the universal periodic review could be implemented as soon as possible. Thailand had abstained in the vote on the basis of its opposition to country-specific resolutions and because the Human Rights Council and universal periodic review were the most appropriate mechanisms for addressing the matter.

48. **Mr. Ulibarri** (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its concern over the grave human rights violations in the Syrian Arab Republic, and maintained its

principled position of voting against any no-action motion, as that mechanism impeded the international community's ability to consider matters of interest to Member States. The Human Rights Council was the competent body for addressing the situation and must be given a prominent role in that regard. It had the tools needed to examine specific cases of concern. His delegation had thus not been a sponsor of the draft resolution. It supported the universal periodic review, which was the appropriate mechanism for the regular review of country situations and could strengthen the Human Rights Council as the highest authority within the United Nations for promoting and protecting human rights throughout the world. Nevertheless, the international community had a responsibility to denounce systematic abuse or violations of human rights anywhere in the world as they occurred, and if necessary, to address them specifically.

49. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that the Committee was not the appropriate forum for addressing country-specific situations, which were best left to the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review mechanism. Therefore his Government had supported the no-action motion and endorsed the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Ecuador adhered to universality, impartiality and non-selectivity in considering human rights matters and believed that specific countries should not be targeted. All States must refrain from threatening territorial integrity and from politicization. Only dialogue would enable effective resolution. For those reasons, Ecuador had voted against the draft resolution.

50. **The Chair** suggested that before concluding the consideration of agenda item 69 as a whole, the Committee should, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, take note of the following documents: Report of the Human Rights Committee (A/66/40); Report of the Committee against Torture (A/66/44); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Voluntary Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery (A/66/217); Report of the Secretary-General on measures to improve further the effectiveness, harmonization and reform of the treaty body system (A/66/344); Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture (A/66/276); Note by the Secretary-General submitting the report of the Chairs for the human rights treaty bodies on their twenty-third meeting (A/66/175); Note by the Secretary-General on the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (A/66/259); Report of the Secretary-General on the draft programme of activities for the International Year for People of African Descent (A/66/342); Report of the Secretary-General on the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (A/66/284); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons (A/66/285); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (A/66/330); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers (A/66/289); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children (A/66/283); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (A/66/254); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the independent expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights (A/66/271); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living and on the right to non-discrimination in this context (A/66/270); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the interim report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education (A/66/269); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights (A/66/265); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (A/66/290); Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 (A/66/358); Reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the international independent commission of inquiry on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire (A/66/518); Report of

the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/66/36).

51. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1: High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Realization of the Millennium Development Goals and Other Internationally Agreed Development Goals for Persons with Disabilities

52. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), making a statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, on the programme budget implications of paragraphs 2, 3(a) and 4 of the draft resolution, said that, with regard to paragraphs 2 and 3(a), it was envisaged that the high-level meeting would comprise one opening plenary meeting from 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., followed by an informal interactive round table until 1 p.m., and another interactive round table from 3 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. followed by a short closing plenary until 6 p.m. on 23 September 2013. That comprised two meetings in total, requiring interpretation services in all six official languages and verbatim record service for the plenary meetings only. The requirements for those and related support services would be covered by the budgetary provisions provided to service the General Assembly on the understanding that there would be no parallel meetings of the General Assembly or its Working Groups.

53. As for paragraph 4, it was estimated that additional requirements of $100,100 would arise to process two documents with a total estimated 17,000 words into all six languages. The Secretary-General would make every effort to absorb the costs within the provision in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013, through more efficient use of resources available.

54. Regarding the wording "within existing resources" in paragraphs 2 and 4, attention was drawn to the provisions of section IV of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 64/243 of 24 December 2009.

55. Therefore, should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, no additional programme budget implications would arise for the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013.

56. **Ms. Maduhu** (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking also on behalf of the Philippines, said that Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iceland, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, the United States of America, Viet Nam and Zambia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

57. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Chad, the Comoros, Guinea, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Maldives, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine and Zimbabwe had also joined the sponsors.

58. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union was committed to the main objective of the draft resolution and hoped that the agreed modalities could lead to substantive discussion and push forward the agenda of persons with disabilities. It had been disappointing that, in the discussion on modalities, some States had expressed a reluctance to ensure the full participation of civil society at the high-level meeting, whereas maintaining a strong and open dialogue with civil society groups within the rules of procedure of the General Assembly would be important for the high-level discussion. The European Union had consistently maintained that the process of admission of non-governmental organizations to participate in the high-level meeting should be transparent and allow for their full involvement. It interpreted paragraph 7 to mean that, within the Assembly, Member States would be able to challenge objections by other States to the presence of civil society representatives or particular non-governmental organizations. That was one reason it had been unable to sponsor the draft resolution. Member States should adopt a more constructive approach in future discussions on civil society participation at the United Nations.

59. **Ms. Hernando** (Philippines), speaking also on behalf of Tanzania and the other co-sponsors, said that the sponsors had endeavoured to draft a balanced text that would enjoy the broadest possible support.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.*

61. **The Chair** suggested that before concluding the consideration of agenda item 27 as a whole, the Committee should, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, take note of the Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (A/66/124), and the Report of the Secretary-General on the world social situation 2011: the global social crisis (A/66/226).

62. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.